DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 379 012 JC 950 080

AUTHOR	Alkin, Marvin C.; Freeman, Marie
TITLE	Matriculation Evaluation: Summary Report, 1991-92.
INSTITUTION	California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Office of the Chancellor.; Educational Evaluation Associates, Northridge, CA.
PUB DATE	Sep 91
NOTE	78p.; For other summary reports, see JC 950 079-081.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Admission (School); Admissions Counseling; *Community Colleges; Counseling Effectiveness; *Counseling Services; Databases; *Institutional Evaluation; Program Effectiveness; Program Implementation; Research and Development; School Orientation; State Surveys; Student Placement; *Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*California Community Colleges

ABSTRACT

In California community colleges, state-mandated matriculation consists of services intended to enhance student success and processes to improve institutional effectiveness by developing capacities for evaluation, coordination, and training. Each year, the Chancellor's Office conducts evaluations to assess the extent to which matriculation is being implemented by the state's community colleges. During the 1991-92 evaluation, matriculation processes at 20 colleges were reviewed by 3- to 6-member site visit teams. The evaluation found that, generally, components were well-implemented, and improvement was noted in most components. Admission, orientation, assessment, and counseling and advisement were the most thoroughly developed components, with noted improvements in assessment since the previous year's evaluation report. Colleges generally made the least progress in implementing student follow-up and research and evaluation components. This report presents 1991-92 findings on: (1) coordination and training; (2) admission; (3) orientation; (4) assessment; (5) counseling and advisement; (6) student follow-up; and (7) research and evaluation. Also highlighted are a number of effective practices at particular colleges which might serve as examples for other colleges. The "Team Member's Guide to the Matriculation Evaluation" at Mission College is appended. (KP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 379 012

Matriculation Evaluation: Summary Report

1991-92

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

September 1992

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Alkin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Prepared for the Chancellor's Office,
California Community Colleges

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EEA
Educational Evaluation Associates
9230 Jellico Avenue
Northridge, California 91325

JC 950 080

MATRICULATION EVALUATION:

SUMMARY REPORT
1991-92

Prepared by

Marvin C. Alkin
and
Marie Freeman

September 1992

Prepared for the Chancellor's Office,
California Community Colleges

Presented to

Dr. Thelma Scott-Skillman Vice Chancellor Student Services	Karen Halliday Dean Student Services	Peter White Matriculation Coordinator

Executive Summary

Matriculation

Matriculation is a process that brings students and colleges into agreement on the students' educational goals and on the appropriate educational choices to reach those goals. Matriculation focuses on student success and institutional effectiveness.

The matriculation process consists of seven components. Five of these are services provided directly to students and intended to provide equitable possibilities of student success (admission, orientation, assessment, counseling/advising, follow-up); and two support colleges and districts inimproving institutional effectiveness by strengthening for evaluation, coordination, and training.
(See pages 1-6)

Matriculation Evaluation

Matriculation was authorized by the Seymour-Campbell Matriculation Act (AB 3) in 1986, with initial state fiscal support beginning in the 1987-88 academic year. The Chancellor's Office began conducting on-site evaluations in 1990-91. Site visits are conducted by teams of professionals ranging from 3 to 6 members, who carefully prepare for the visits in conjunction with the Chancellor's Office and EEA. During the 1991-92 academic year, matriculation processes at 20 colleges were reviewed (see Appendix A for a listing of sites). This report summarizes those on-site evaluations. (See pages 7-11)

Matriculation Evaluation: Findings and Recommendations

- Generally, components were well-implemented, and improvement was noted in most components, but some components still require additional development.
- Admission, orientation, assessment, and counseling and advisement were the most thoroughly developed components, with noted improvement in assessment since last year's evaluation report.
- Colleges generally made the least progress in implementing student follow-up and research and evaluation components. (See pages 12-13)

Coordination and Training

- Authority and responsibility: *improved administrative authority* (See page 14)
- Formal matriculation policies: *uniform compliance* (See page 14)
- Matriculation advisory committees: *involvement varied; broader membership needed* (See page 15)
- Campus commitment to matriculation: *varied widely* (See page 15)
- Inservice training: *improved* (See page 16)
- Exemption criteria: *most campuses have written criteria; application practices need improvement* (See page 16)
- Student rights and responsibilities: *students appropriately informed at most campuses* (See page 17)
- Alternative and modified services: *improvement, but need further attention to services for students with special needs* (See page 17)

Admission

- Admission activities: *generally well implemented* (See page 18)
- Application procedures: *generally well implemented; changes taking place at a number of colleges; some computer-related problems* (See page 18)

Orientation

- Orientation: *generally well-implemented* (See page 19)
- Presentation modes: *varied; greater consistency of content needed; involvement of additional constituencies* (See page 20)
- Specialized orientations: *generally available* (See page 21)

Assessment

- Assessment: *substantial progress in selection of appropriate assessment instruments* (See page 21)
- Systematizing Assessment Procedures: *more testing specialists; need for defined testing rooms; greater availability of times* (See page 23)
- Assessment instruments: *consistency found for most testing; need for improvement in testing language minority students* (See page 23)
- Multiple measures: *improvement noted, but further attention required* (See page 24)
- Validation of tests: *required* (See page 25)

Counseling and Advisement

- Counseling component: *generally well-developed* (See page 27)
- Specialized counseling: *generally available* (See page 27)
- Student Educational Plans (SEPs): *incomplete implementation* (See page 27)

Student Follow Up

- Follow up: *generally, one of the least well implemented components* (See page 29)
- Special populations: *monitoring procedures functioning well* (See page 29)

Research and Evaluation

- Implementation of component: *minimum progress* (See page 31)
- Use of research and evaluation: *lack of commitment to utilization* (See page 32)
- College data base: *not adequate* (See page 32)

Successful Matriculation Practices

- Overall, the review teams noted a number of effective aspects of particular components which might serve as examples for other colleges. (See page 34)

Coordination and Training

The site visits revealed that the trend noted in 1990-91 toward greater commitment to matriculation among faculty and staff continued this year, as did a trend to consolidate the responsibility, authority and visibility for matriculation coordination. The colleges are moving toward establishing long-term policies and procedures that speak to the rights, obligations, protections, and responsibilities of students and colleges.

- Lake Tahoe Community College (See page 35)
- Mission College (See page 35)

Admission

This component was strong across all colleges. Colleges were especially strong in diversifying admission processes and accommodating their diverse student populations.

- Foothill College (See page 36)
- Modesto Junior College (See page 36)

Assessment

Increasingly, colleges are involving instructional faculty in the assessment process and in providing placement advice. The use of multiple measures and valid instruments, as well as assessment's advisory nature, were increasingly accepted.

- City College of San Francisco (See page 37)
- Yuba College (See page 37)

Orientation

Another strong component across colleges this year, orientation was being implemented comprehensively through a variety of modes. Although counselors played primary roles, the colleges were increasingly involving instructional faculty, staff, and students.

- Mt. San Jacinto College (See page 38)
- College of the Redwoods (See page 38)
- Cypress College (See page 39)
- Feather River College (See page 39)

Counseling and Advising

Counseling and advising were heavily utilized at each college, with counselors directly involved in all matriculation components, especially orientation, assessment, and follow-up. Personnel in this component proved to be very committed to providing student services, making appropriate student referrals and ensuring some form of educational planning. The teams noted greater instructional faculty participation in advising and greater attention paid to the needs of bilingual students. Though their roles varied significantly, counselors handled their roles quite effectively in the majority of colleges.

- Shasta College (See page 40)
- Fresno City College (See page 40)
- Columbia College (See page 41)
- Las Positas College (See page 41)

Follow Up

Many colleges had seemingly made progress in this component. Most campuses provided follow-up procedures for students in special programs, and a few colleges had fully implemented early alert systems for the general student population. The best of these were employed early in the semester, involved extensive instructor participation, and utilized counseling and advisement information.

- Chabot College (See page 42)
- Lake Tahoe Community College (See page 42)

Research and Evaluation

In a number of instances, colleges have begun to develop the appropriate research infrastructures with trained personnel and adequate data bases to meet state requirements. Several colleges appeared to be well on the way toward fully implementing this component.

- Cypress College (See page 43)
- Solano Community College (See page 43)
- Mission College (See page 44)

Chapter One

Introduction

This chapter presents a brief overview of matriculation objectives and components and a description of the matriculation site visit evaluation process.

Matriculation: An Overview

Matriculation is a statewide effort to equitably improve student success in the California Community Colleges by bringing students and colleges into agreement on the students' educational goals and on the appropriate educational choices to reach those goals. The origins of matriculation lie in a resolution adopted in 1982 by the Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges. The resolution, "Matriculated Student," maintained that students seeking a degree or certificate should be designated as "matriculated" and held to certain requirements. In 1984, the Board of Governors adopted a plan to implement matriculation as a model process.

The Seymour-Campbell Matriculation Act (AB 3), passed in 1986, authorized matriculation, and state fiscal support began in the 1987-88 academic year. At thattime, districts received only 20% of the estimated state share of matriculation costs. By 1989-90, state funding of matriculation reached the state's full share of implementation costs. It is important to note that state support was intended to meet 25% of matriculation's overall costs, while the districts were expected to fund the remaining 75%. In fact, many districts have provided fiscal support well above the legal minimum.

Each year since 1987-88, the state Chancellor's Office has conducted an evaluation of matriculation to assess the extent to which the process was

being implemented. For the first three years of state funding, evaluations aggregated information drawn from written documents submitted by all colleges and districts to identify broad areas of strengths and weaknesses during the initial stages of matriculation's development. Colleges and districts were to have fully implemented all matriculation components by June 30, 1991.

In 1990-91, the evaluation approach shifted to a much more detailed, on-site examination of matriculation's implementation, including its impact on students. There have now been two full years of on-site program reviews, with 37 colleges evaluated.

Matriculation Purpose and Goals

The purpose of the matriculation process is well-defined in the legislative intent statement which is part of the Seymour-Campbell Matriculation Act of 1986. The legislature noted a concern for ensuring equal educational opportunity for all Californians. It also indicated that this purpose is best accomplished by providing students "with the information to establish realistic educational goals." Colleges are directed to "ensure that the matriculation process does not exclude students from receiving appropriate educational services at community colleges." Moreover, colleges are to formulate sets of educational services "necessary to optimize their [students'] opportunities for success."

The Board of Governors was mindful of these purposes in developing its 1987 Student Matriculation Plan. They framed two facets of the matriculation task: student success and institutional effectiveness. The Matriculation Unit of the Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges, subsequently described these two primary goals:

Student success requires that the institution assist students to make educational choices by utilizing multiple assessment measures for course placement advice and a conscientiously applied supportive service strategy. Through comprehensive orientations in which educational programs, facilities, resources, and support services are described, students are made aware of the institution's commitment to student achievement. This commitment is reinforced by the institution's interaction with the student to strengthen motivation, provide frequent feedback on students' performance and generally encourage students to define educational goals that may be realized with effort and supportive assistance.

Institutional effectiveness is determined by the effective and efficient use of the institution's resources as they are applied to students' educational needs, as well as the resolve to provide additional resources as needed. In this regard, the retention of students is achieved, in part, by the institution's efficient delivery of services and programs coupled with appropriate curricular changes and development. This strengthening of the institution through an effective matriculation process extends to the increased ability of the districts and colleges to:

1. Identify the educational needs and objectives of students via the assessment process and use of the student educational plan;

2. Assure that campus supportive services are available and fully utilized by students;

3. Increase the participation and incorporation of all non-exempt credit students, regardless of their educational preparation and consistent with the mission of the community colleges;

4. Provide sufficient staff and services to meet student needs;

5. Develop a program of institutional research and evaluation that will identify the extent to which the matriculation process contributes to students' and institutions' successful achievement of their objectives; and

6. Increase the opportunities for instructional faculty to interact in their classes with students who are motivated to learn and properly assisted when making course selections that are appropriate to their skills and academic potential.

Components of Matriculation

The matriculation process consists of seven components. Five of these provide services directly to students to enhance possibilities of student success; and two relate to colleges and districts improving institutional effectiveness by developing capabilities for evaluation, coordination, and training.

Admissions: For this component, AB 3 simply specifies: "Processing of the application for admission." The Board of Governors' 1987 Plan further elaborates that new student information should be maintained so that it can be used in "fulfilling the purposes, goals and accountability expectations of this plan." Such information about new students might include: need for support services; exemption status; referrals to other college services and resources; and support of the registration process. The Board of Governors' 1987 Plan also specifies that modified or alternative admissions services should be provided (if necessary) for ethnic and language minority students and students with disabilities.

Orientation: State regulations require colleges to provide students with timely information concerning college procedures and course scheduling, academic expectations, and financial assistance. In addition, students are to be informed in writing of their rights and responsibilities at the college, their right to choose to participate in matriculation components, including those appropriately exempted from this component, and the processes by which they may waive participation, and file grievances or appeals.

Assessment: AB 3 and Title 5 direct colleges to gather information about individual students in order to facilitate student success. Assessment may include, but is not limited to, information about the student's study skills, language proficiency, computational skills, aptitudes, goals, learning skills, career aspirations, academic performance, and number of hours on the job. Assessment and course placement based upon assessment should be advisory -- not mandatory. Over the past three years, the Chancellor has continued to develop a list of approved assessment instruments and guidelines for colleges' use.

Counseling/Advising: State regulations specify that colleges will make reasonable efforts to ensure that matriculating students participate in counseling or guidance with appropriately trained staff to pursue a specific educational goal. The opportunity to develop an individual student education plan (SEP) is to be made available to for each non-exempt student. It is intended that information collected through assessment activities be used to inform counseling or advising decisions. Particularly targeted for counseling are students who have not declared an educational goal, students in pre-collegiate basic skills courses, and students who are on probation.

Follow-up: AB3 specifies that colleges shall provide post-enrollment evaluation of each student's progress. Title 5 mandates further that follow -up systems be established to monitor each student in order to detect early signs of academic difficulty. As a result of follow-up, students who have not declared a specific educational goal, students enrolled in pre-collegiate basic skills courses, and students who are on probation are to be identified and referred to appropriate services.

Research and Evaluation: Title 5 requires colleges to establish "a program of institutional research for on-going evaluation of the effectiveness of its matriculation process." Colleges are to consider the impact of the matriculation process on such things as: courses, programs, and facilities; definition of student educational goals; assessment of student educational needs; and various indicators of student success. These research studies should help colleges to evaluate matriculation services and to identify areas in which improvement is needed and/or where a greater allocation of resources should be considered.

Coordination and Training: The coordination component consists of efforts to involve the broadest possible range of college staff and students in designing, implementing and evaluating matriculation services. Districts/colleges typically select and assign one staff person the responsibility for coordinating the matriculation process. Hand in hand with the coordination aspect is effective training. Title 5 regulations state that: "Each community college district shall develop and implement a program for providing all faculty and staff with training appropriate to their needs on the provision of matriculation services."

Matriculation Evaluation Procedures

The Chancellor's Office began conducting detailed, on-site evaluations in 1990-91. The selection of sites to be reviewed is based upon the six-year accreditation calendar. Site visits are planned for colleges during the fourth year of their accreditation cycle, that is, during the year prior to the college's self-study year. This approach provides districts and programs with a predictable timeframe on which to prepare for matriculation evaluations, and it contributes useful information to the college's self-study.

During the 1991-92 academic year, 20 colleges' matriculation processes were reviewed. Appendix A contains a list of these colleges. In addition, two colleges underwent abbreviated site visits to follow-up on problem areas which had been identified by review teams during regular evaluations the previous year. These one-day return visits were conducted by members of the Matriculation Unit of the Chancellor's Office.

Evaluation Purposes: Matriculation evaluation site visits are designed to examine the implementation and overall effectiveness of the matriculation process. The evaluations have four main purposes:

1. To provide formative evaluation information to the colleges regarding matriculation implementation, and to assist the colleges in strengthening the process;

2. To provide the colleges with detailed and timely information on matriculation, for use in the colleges' accreditation self-study process;

3. To provide the Chancellor's office with detailed information on the implementation of matriculation at individual colleges, and with information that can be aggregated for required state-wide reporting (e.g. annual reports to the legislature; reports to the Board of Governors, CPEC, and other agencies); and

4. To provide staff at individual colleges the opportunity to exchange ideas and experiences with Chancellor's Office staff and with their colleagues from other colleges on the review team.

Team Selection: In 1991-92, matriculation evaluations were conducted by teams composed of between three and six professionals. The number of members was determined primarily by the size and complexity of the matriculation process at the college under review. A staff member from Educational Evaluation Associates participated on each team as the team leader. A staff person from the Matriculation Unit of the Chancellor's Office participated as an observer on each visit. Team members were chosen from regions other than the region which included the college to be reviewed and were carefully screened to avoid potential conflicts of interest. Most often, teams were composed of a mix of positions representing deans, vice presidents of instruction and student services, matriculation coordinators, directors of counseling and guidance, counselors and instructional faculty members. Team members during the 1991-92 review year came from 52 different colleges.

Preparation for Site Visits: Careful preparation is an important part of the matriculation evaluation process. When all parties in the evaluation share clear expectations about the purposes of the review and the procedures involved, it is more likely that the review process will yield thorough, accurate findings and will have beneficial results. The representative from the Chancellor's Office and EEA staff share responsibility for communicating with colleges prior to the visit to clarify requirements, to make site and scheduling arrangements, and to respond to questions and concerns. Most importantly, appropriate college staff members areidentified well in advance, and appointments are scheduled with specific evaluation team members, in line with the team member's assigned responsibilities for the visit. Individually, team members also engage in a good deal of pre-site visit

preparation. Each member receives the college's approved matriculation plan along with updates, revisions, annual progress reports, and a variety of college-developed material (Student Educational Plan forms, brochures, announcements, program descriptions, etc.). Each team member also receives a team member handbook which explained specific responsibilities and on-site procedures (see Appendix B).

Timeline: Evaluation visits were conducted between September 24, 1991 and May 21, 1992. Typically, the site visit began on Tuesday noon with a meeting of the matriculation team for a briefing with the team leader and a discussion of individual responsibilities. The evaluations concluded with an exit interview early Friday afternoon. Teams typically conducted interviews and observations during the 8-5 workday, with evening meetings for coordination of findings and team write-up. A sample time schedule for the visits is presented in Appendix B.

Site Visit Procedures: The site visit is intended to allow the team to gain insights into the operation of the matriculation process. Before arriving on campus, the team members have reviewed program plans, updates, revisions and annual progress reports, as well as other materials. The site visit provides an opportunity for extensive interviewing for a review of files and other documentation available on campus, and for direct observations of matriculation activities. Team members areguided by the matriculation plan the college has submitted to the Chancellor's Office for approval, by Title 5 regulations, and by the Board of Governors' 1984 and 1987 plans for matriculation implementation. Specific activities during the matriculation visit are described below:

Activity 1: Matriculation Team Briefing

The matriculation team meets at Tuesday noon of each visit to review

areas of individual responsibility, further define procedures, and clarify areas of concern.

Activity 2: Introductory Meeting with College

Team members meets with a group of appropriate college staff to introduce themselves and to explain the purpose of the visit. The team leader makes this presentation.

Activity 3: Introductory Meeting with College President

If the President has not been present at the earlier meeting, representative team members, usually including the team leader, meet with the President (or designee) to introduce themselves, to discuss the purpose of the visit, and to confirm the schedule for the exit interview.

Activity 4: Review Matriculation Program with Coordinator

Team members and observers meet with the matriculation coordinator to identify the college staff responsible for various matriculation activities in order to assure that all appropriate, knowledgeable individuals will be interviewed, and to obtain a complete overview of matriculation.

Activity 5: Staff and Other Interviews

Each team member is assigned responsibility for one or two matriculation components and conducts interviews in line with those information needs. Each member typically conducts 10-15 interviews.

Activity 6: Team Meetings to Discuss Findings

Throughout the site visit, team members meet informally to share their insights and findings. They discuss schedules and identify issues requiring further clarification. The team leader conducts these

meetings.

Activity 7: Team Meeting to Prepare Summary and Recommendations
Team members meet on Thursday afternoon and evening to prepare a written summary of findings and recommendations.

Activity 8: Pre-Exit Interview with Matriculation Coordinator
Team members meet with the Matriculation Coordinator early on Friday to present the statement of matriculation findings and recommendations. The Matriculation Coordinator is given the opportunity to offer comments and, as a result of the pre-exit interview, the team occasionally makes revisions in its summary.

Activity 9: Pre-Exit Interview with President
The team leader and additional appropriate team members usually meet with the President to present the summary of findings and recommendations. Based on the President's comments, revisions are occasionally made in the summary statement.

Activity 10: Exit Interview
Team members meet with all appropriate college personnel to present a full summary of findings and recommendations.

Chapter Two
Matriculation Evaluation
Findings and Recommedations

The matriculation on-site reviews are intended to serve a number of general purposes. In light of the required full implementation deadline of June 31, 1991, two of these purposes are particularly relevant: to help improve matriculation processes at individual colleges and to identify general matriculation strengths and weaknesses across colleges statewide. This section presents a summary of the findings which matriculation review teams delivered to the 20 colleges reviewed in 1991-92. The summary describes typical, recurring situations and themes rather than idiosyncratic individual campus conditions. This chapter focuses primarily on areas of needed improvement, while the following chapter presents exemplary or model matriculation practices.

Review teams matched the operations of each college with matriculation plans the college had submitted to the Chancellor's Office and with the standards set forth in Title 5 and AB 3. Where there were discrepancies between actual operations and the proposed activities in the plan or where a matriculation process was clearly out of compliance with state regulations, the review team prepared recommendations for improvement. During the course of a review, a team did not deliberately make comparisons among colleges. Each review was highly individualized. However, when the year's findings and recommendations are taken as a whole, some generalizations emerged about consistent strengths and weaknesses in the matriculation process across the 20 colleges.

To identify common features, findings and recommendations for all 20

colleges were compiled according to each of the seven matriculation program components: admission, orientation, assessment, counseling and advisement, student follow-up, coordination and training, and research and evaluation. Where appropriate, the report makes some references to the 1990 -91 summary report findings.

Coordination and Training

Title 5 and AB 3 specify only that "a college will develop and implement a program for providing faculty and staff with training appropriate to their needs with respect to providing matriculation services." The Chancellor's Office has included this relatively limited standard under the broader Coordination and Training component, that directly relates to management.

COORDINATION AND TRAINING

Component Standards

Develop and implement a program for providing all faculty and staff with training appropriate to their needs with respect to provision of matriculation services.

1. Admissions
2. Orientation
3. Assessment
4. Counseling/Advisement
5. Follow-Up
6. Research and Evaluation

Authority and Responsibility: *Improved administrative authority*

At 13 of the colleges reviewed in 1991-92, responsibility for matriculation lay in administrative positions which were vested with sufficient authority to manage a cross-departmental effort. These positions, usually within student services units, included Vice Presidents, Deans, and Associate Deans. This finding varied somewhat from the 1990-91 observation that a part-time director, usually a counselor, served as the matriculation coordinator. This is not to say that the issue of authority was not salient among this year's reviews. Six Matriculation Directors, several in part-time positions, carried full responsibility for matriculation without the authority to make significant decisions. Of the thirteen administrators mentioned earlier, three of the Deans had delegated day-to-day responsibilities for matriculation operations to subordinates, who reported frustration with their enormously diverse responsibilities and lack of authority. Not too surprisingly, the team noted a lack of overall matriculation integration and institutional commitment at five of the colleges whose efforts were administered by coordinators or directors with little direct authority.

Formal Matriculation Policies: *Uniform Compliance*

Most colleges had written, formally adopted policy statements that guided matriculation programs. In compliance with Title 5, district governing boards had adopted matriculation policies at sixteen of the colleges under review.

Matriculation Advisory Committees:

- ***Involvement varied***
- ***Broader membership needed***

All of the colleges had Matriculation Advisory Committees, but their level of involvement varied. The groups rarely met at two colleges, while at seven of the colleges, the committees met frequently and were notably well-informed about matriculation. At four colleges, review teams reported that Matriculation Advisory Committees became actively and directly involved in program development, while at thirteen colleges, committees functioned primarily as forums for communicating information about matriculation to selected on-campus parties.

Another common finding was that membership on Matriculation Advisory Committees often did not represent some of the significant campus constituencies. Review teams suggested adding students, classified staff, or instructors to the committees at ten colleges.

Campus Commitment to Matriculation: *Varied widely*

The extent to which matriculation was perceived as an integrated, campus-wide commitment varied greatly from college to college. At least eight of the review teams reported that matriculation was viewed as a student services program with little instructional purpose. Instructional faculty at these campuses typically demonstrated little knowledge about even the most pertinent matriculation-related instructional issues such as assessment, course prerequisite validation, and early academic alert systems. High levels of instructional faculty involvement were evident when matriculation coordinators frequently, directly, and personally solicited

instructional perspectives in the decision-making process.

Inservice Training:

Improved

Inservice training received mixed reviews from the teams but was more systematic than in the prior year. About half of the colleges presented effective training within individual matriculation components. College -wide training was needed to clarify overall matriculation purposes and processes at about 10 colleges. More specifically, the reviewers noted that training should be focused on instructional faculty to encourage their informed participation in matriculation.

The review teams found a number of issues which cut across matriculation components on several campuses: exemption criteria, statements of student rights and responsibilities, and special accommodations for ethnic and language minority students.

Exemption Criteria:

- *Most campuses have written criteria.*
- *Application practices need improvement.*

Criteria for exempting students from matriculation components were either unspecified, unclear, or inconsistently applied at nine colleges. This represents a smaller proportion of the colleges reviewed this year than in 1990-91, when review teams cited problems with exemption criteria at all but four colleges. This year, the team found that most campuses had written exemption criteria, but that there were problems with the way the criteria were applied. In many cases, the same criteria --often a single criterion--would be used to issue a blanket exemption from all matriculation components. Instead,

specific exemption criteria should have been determined for each matriculation component. Review teams found that admission staff applied the exemption criteria at eight colleges. In about six cases, staff were not trained adequately about the interrelationship of matriculation components to determine exemption status. Inconsistent, unclear exemption practices also stymied research and evaluation efforts at some colleges.

Student Rights and Responsibilities: *Students appropriately informed at most campuses*

Students were not appropriately informed of their rights and responsibilities regarding matriculation at most campuses. At five colleges, students were not consistently or fully informed. More specifically, in some cases exemption criteria were not made explicit; written procedures for challenging matriculation regulatory provisions were inadequate; students were not informed about their right to appeal requirements of any prerequisite, including test results; or they were not informed of their right to choose to participate in any component.

Alternative and Modified Services: *Improvement, but need further attention to services for students with special needs*

Review teams recommended that colleges implement modified or alternative services for ethnic or language minority students at nine campuses, mainly in the admissions and the assessment components, where teams identified a need for bilingual staff or for materials translated into languages other than English. Nevertheless, there was far greater attention to the provision of these services than in the prior year.

Admission

Admission Activities: *Generally well implemented*

Admission component standards were generally well implemented at the 20 colleges. Review teams found that in addition to their more traditional registration and record-keeping roles, many admissions offices assumed responsibility for determining students' matriculation exemption status and for scheduling assessment and orientation appointments.

ADMISSION COMPONENT

Component Standards

1. Provide a procedure for the processing of the admissions applications.
2. Provide modified or alternative services for the matriculation process (if necessary) for ethnic and language minority students and students with disabilities.

Application Procedures:
- *Generally well implemented*
- *Changes taking place at a number of campuses*
- *Some computer-related problems*

New, usually electronically scannable, application forms had been proposed or implemented in eight colleges in order to capture required M.I.S. data and student information for assessment. Several campuses had initiated application options intended to encourage student enrollment; for example, mail-in or telephone registration and registration materials translated into Spanish.

Serious inefficiencies in the admission process were noted at eight colleges. Problems with computers

accounted for half of these.

Orientation

Orientation: *Generally well-implemented*

In general, orientation was a well-implemented component and in line with state regulations. Standards specify types of information to be provided to students, and most of the colleges met this requirement in a wide variety of ways.

ORIENTATION COMPONENT

Component Standards

1. Provide students and potential students with information concerning college programs, services, facilities and grounds, academic expectations, and institutional procedures in a timely manner.
2. Provide written definitions informing students of their rights and responsibilities.
3. Promptly inform students of their right to appeal requirements of any prerequisite based on the unavailability of the necessary course.
4. Inform students of procedures for alleging unlawful discrimination.
5. Provide students with or direct them to written district procedures for: challenging matriculation regulatory provisions; district investigation and attempted resolution of complaints; and methods by which the district maintains such complaints.
6. Provide modified or alternative services for the matriculation process (if necessary) for ethnic and language minority students and students with disabilities.
7. Adopt District governing board policies specifying criteria for exemption.
8. Make exempted students aware that they may choose whether or not to participate in **this component**.
9. Ensure that exemptions from this component are not based upon a sole criterion.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Presentation Modes:
- *varied*
- *greater consistency of content needed*
- *involvement of additional constituencies*

Almost all colleges offered group orientations, and many linked the presentations with assessment at the beginning of the semester. Eleven colleges had prepared orientation videos to be used either in conjunction with or in lieu of live presentations. However, two colleges had decided to discontinue using videos because the cost of updating them was too great, and two had decided that videos should only be used to augment a live presentation. Nine campuses also provided extended orientation opportunities through special guidance classes, and one campus provided orientation materials almost exclusively by mail.

Review teams often recommended that information be complete and consistent from one orientation presentation or mode of delivery to another. Student handbooks at nine colleges tended to assure greater consistency in the type of information students received, and written scripts led to consistency among groups of presenters.

Orientations tended to be conducted only by counselors at more than half of the colleges. Consequently, the review teams recommended that other groups such as students and instructional faculty members become more involved in presenting orientations.

Recommendations were offered at almost half of the colleges to include in orientation materials written

statements of students' rights and responsibilities regarding matriculation. Frequently, this information was either missing, incomplete, or inconsistent from one document or presentation to another.

Specialized Orientations: *Generally available*

The review teams found that at almost all campuses, students in EOPS and DSPS, as well as other groups such as athletes, received special orientations. However, at eight campuses, the teams called for modified orientation services for language minority students.

Review teams noted that some form of orientation was conducted throughout the year at only seven sites. Typically, orientations occurred only at the beginning of the semester during registration periods.

In line with the 1990-91 finding, few campuses evaluated their orientation activities or tracked student participation in the component, making it difficult for review teams (or the colleges themselves) to determine the extent of student participation or how successful the activities had been.

Assessment

Assessment: *Substantial progress in selection of appropriate assessment instruments*

Component standards consistent with AB3 and Title 5 provide a framework for selection and appropriate use of assessment instruments. The team noted that many colleges were making progress toward meeting these standards and were attempting to displace old attitudes

about placement testing and to adopt state-approved instruments and practices.

ASSESSMENT COMPONENT

Component Standards

1. Conduct assessment for all non-exempt students.
2. Administer assessment instruments to determine student competency in computational and language skills.
3. Assist students to identify their aptitudes, interests, and educational objectives.
4. Evaluate students' study and learning skills.
5. Use assessment instruments approved by the Chancellor.
6. Use assessment instruments only for purposes for which they were developed or validated.
7. Use multiple measures (other than two or more highly correlated instruments) for placement, required and appropriate referral, or subsequent evaluation.
8. Use assessment instruments, methods, or procedures in an advisory manner in the selection of academic courses and educational programs.
9. Provide modified or alternative services for the matriculation process (if necessary) for ethnic and language minority students and students with disabilities.
10. Adopt District governing board policies specifying criteria for exemption.
11. Make exempted students aware that they may choose whether or not to participate in **this component.**
12. Ensure that exemptions from this component are not based upon a sole criterion.

There was further progress in dedicating personnel and space to assessment activities. Testing specialists or technicians conducted assessment activities at eleven of

Systematizing Assessment Procedures:
- *more testing specialists*
- *need for defined testing rooms*
- *greater availability of times*

the colleges. Review teams reported that there were dedicated testing centers on seven campuses. However, on five campuses, it was noted that testing was conducted in whatever rooms were available, often creating notable problems for students and staff at the colleges.

It appeared that colleges were moving toward offering some type of assessment throughout the year, with only five review teams reporting that tests were given exclusively during registration periods at the beginning of the semester.

Assessment Instruments:
- *Consistency found for most testing*
- *need for improvement in testing language minority students*

Although the colleges as a group used at least 11 different published testing instruments, there was some consistency among them. Almost all tested only language and mathematics skills. Very few assessed study skills, aptitudes or interests. Most had selected instruments from the list pending approval from the Chancellor's Office or were waiting for that list to be expanded. At least eleven reports indicated that the colleges used the Assessment and Placement Center Services for Community Colleges (APS) instruments to measure language skills. The Mathematics Diagnostic Testing Project (MDPT) subtests were used for placement recommendations on at least eight campuses. The Computerized Placement Tests (CPT) provided year -round testing opportunities at three colleges.

There was little consistency across the colleges in the instruments and practices used to measure English

proficiency among language minority students. Review teams indicated that at four colleges, ESL testing needed improvement.

Locally developed writing samples were used at eight colleges. In almost all of these cases, team members indicated that, contrary to state regulations, the brief, unvalidated writing samples were used to influence class changes after students had already enrolled.

Multiple Measures: *Improvement noted but further attention required*

The colleges appeared to be moving, albeit slowly, toward a broader definition of assessment as a means of utilizing multiple measures of student needs and capabilities in order to recommend course alternatives. However, the common practice was to recommend placement based upon very limited criteria. Several colleges had begun collecting a variety of information about student interests and special needs. For example, the CAPP was used at five colleges with plans to integrate this information into the general student data files. On the other hand, review teams reported that even though multiple measures were collected at some colleges, they did not appear to be used. Fourteen review teams reported that colleges did not consistently use multiple measures to recommend course placement.

Review teams found that faculty and staff across the colleges were generally aware that student participation in assessment and placement were to be voluntary. However, at least eight of the colleges still allowed

practices which amounted to mandatory placement. In most cases, students were simply not clearly and consistently informed of their rights to waive participation in testing or that placements were advisory.

At almost half the colleges, review teams recommended that instructional faculty members become more directly involved in the assessment component. In many cases, instructors had not been involved in selecting testing instruments, had been only marginally involved in determining cutoff scores, and were generally uninformed about the need for validation studies.

Validation of Tests: ***Required***

Review teams found that at least five colleges had begun validation studies on tests used for placement recommendations, local cutoff scores, locally developed assessment instruments, or courses used as prerequisites. No colleges had yet completed validation studies for all of these. This is an area of substantial deficiency.

Counseling and Advisement

Language contained within AB3 and Title 5 provide guidelines for a number of component standards related to the counseling and advising component. Standards for this component specify how services are to be provided, populations to be served, and procedures for informing students.

COUNSELING/ADVISEMENT COMPONENT

Component Standards

1. Make appropriate referral(s) to available support services.
2. Provide advisement concerning course selection.
3. Make reasonable efforts to ensure that probationary non-exempt students participate in counseling.
4. Make reasonable efforts to ensure that non-exempt students without a declared educational goal participate in counseling.
5. Make reasonable efforts to ensure that non-exempt students enrolled in pre-collegiate basic skills courses participate in counseling or advisement.
6. Make counseling or advisement available to all non-exempt students.
7. Provide counseling or advisement by appropriately trained counselors or staff in areas deemed appropriate by the district.
8. Provide assistance in the development of the student educational plan.
9. Record the student educational plan in written or electronic form.
10. Review, as necessary, the student educational plan, its implementation, and its accuracy related to students' needs.
11. Promptly inform students of their right to appeal requirements of any prerequisite based on the unavailability of a course.
12. Inform students of procedures for alleging unlawful discrimination.
13. Provide students with or direct them to written district procedures for: challenging matriculation regulatory provisions; district investigation and attempted resolution of complaints; and methods by which the district maintains such complaints.
14. Provide modified or alternative services for the matriculation process (if necessary) for ethnic and language minority students and students with disabilities.
15. Adopt District governing board policies specifying criteria for exemption.
16. Make exempted students aware that they may choose whether or not to participate in **this component.**

Counseling Component: *Generally well-developed.*

Counseling components were well developed, although not fully implemented, on the campuses visited. Certificated, professional counselors provided services at virtually all colleges, while five campuses also relied to some extent upon paraprofessional advisors and a large number of part-time professional counselors. At six colleges, review teams observed that the counseling departments were understaffed for at least part of the year and unable to provide services as fully as required, or as described in the college's matriculation plan.

Instructional faculty were involved with advisement at seven of the colleges. Review teams cautioned them to maintain close cooperation and coordination withe the counseling staff to assure that students receive accurate, timely and consistent information and that instructors have a clear understanding of their advisement role and responsibilities.

Specialized Counseling: *Generally available*

Specialized counseling was available on almost all campuses for students involved in various categorical programs such as EOPS, DSPS, and GAIN, and in athletic programs. Review teams did indicate a need for special counseling for ethnic and language minority students at five colleges.

Student Educational Plans (SEPs): *Incomplete implementation*

Although a clear majority of the campuses had some system in place to develop student educational plans (SEP), as a rule, few students completed plans with counselors. Even fewer students reviewed and modified

SEPs as they progressed through their programs. The finding in 1990-91 that filing and access systems were inefficient or inadequate and that electronic systems were either not available or underutilized continued among the 1991-92 sites. Tracking systems were inadequate or inconsistent at 11 colleges.

A closely related finding was that many colleges failed to comply with the requirement to counsel and follow-up with students in pre-collegiate basic skills courses and students who had not declared an educational goal. Campuses were more successful with the traditional practice of monitoring students on probation who were already tracked by the registrar's office.

Student Follow-up

Standards designed to satisfy legislation and regulations for this component require the development of a follow -up system to monitor all credit students' academic progress and assure appropriate referrals, if required.

STUDENT FOLLOW-UP COMPONENT

Component Standards

1. Provide post-enrollment evaluation of each non-exempt student's academic progress enrolled under specific academic conditions.
2. Establish a follow-up system that ensures regular monitoring for early detection of academic difficulty.
3. Make referrals to appropriate services/curricula as necessary.

4. Provide modified or alternative services for the matriculation process (if necessary) for ethnic and language minority students and students with disabilities.

Although this continued to be one of the least well-developed matriculation components, a number of colleges demonstrated progress. Eight colleges had a system in place or had proposed a system for some type of midterm progress reporting. Only three review teams reported that the colleges had met the requirements of Title 5 to follow up the progress of students in basic skills courses and students who had not declared an educational goal. The few fully implemented systems were based upon close cooperation between the registrar/admissions office and the counseling department. They alerted all students early in the semester through electronic mailings; they involved instructional faculty in designing and implementing the systems; they were coordinated with categorically funded groups; and they offered specific recommendations to students for academic or skills improvement. However, the role of instructional faculty with respect to their provision of meaningful, early intervention was often not readily apparent.

Follow Up: *Generally, one of the least well implemented components*

Campuses continued to have well-developed follow up procedures for specific groups of students such as EOPS, DSPS, GAIN, and athletes. These procedures had been in place before state-supported matriculation had been initiated.

Special Populations: *Monitoring procedures functioning well*

Research and Evaluation

AB3 and Title 5 specify a large number of standards for matriculation research and evaluation. These standards suggest the types of data to be systematically collected and the areas in which analyses are to be performed.

RESEARCH AND EVALUATION COMPONENT

Component Standards

1. Establish and maintain institutional research for evaluating efficacy of matriculation services and remedial programs and services.
2. Evaluate all assessment instruments to ensure that they minimize or eliminate cultural or linguistic bias and are being used in a valid manner.
3. Determine whether any assessment instrument, method, or procedure has a disproportionate impact on particular groups of students described in terms of ethnicity, gender, age or disability.
4. Analyze degree of matriculation's impact on particular courses, programs and facilities.
5. Analyze degree to which matriculation helps students to define their educational goals and objectives.
6. Analyze extent to which matriculation promotes student success as evidenced by student outcomes, persistence, skill improvement, grades, and goal attainment.
7. Analyze degree to which matriculation assists district efforts to assess educational needs.
8. Analyze degree to which matriculation matches district resources with students' educational needs.
9. Analyze degree to which matriculation refers students to specialized support services and programs.
10. Determine ethnicity, sex, and age of credit students.
11. Determine proportion of students of ethnic, gender, age and disability groups **placed** in pre-collegiate, associate degree-applicable, or transfer courses in reading, writing, computation, or ESL.
12. Determine proportion of students of ethnic, gender, age and disability groups who **enter** and **complete** pre-collegiate basic skills courses.

13. Determine proportion of students of ethnic, gender, age and disability groups who **complete** pre-collegiate basic skills courses and who **subsequently enter** and **complete** associate degree-applicable courses.

14. Record number of students exempted by category and grounds for exemption.

15. Maintain numbers of students filing complaints and the basis of those complaints.

16. Document particular matriculation services received by each non-exempt student.

Implementation of Component: *Minimum progress*

Following the 1990-91 trend, a majority of the 20 campuses were far from fully implementing the research and evaluation component. However, several campuses had made significant progress toward that goal, and most of the others had at least begun to address research and evaluation issues.

Colleges varied in the extent to which they had addressed the standards. Eleven campuses had not yet begun required validation studies of their assessment practices. Only three had made notable progress in validating assessment or course prerequisites. Five had implemented studies of the disproportionate impact of matriculation on various groups of students. Four had conducted some studies of the impact of matriculation components on the college programs, and several had collected information through student satisfaction surveys.

Twelve colleges had designated an individual to be the institutional or matriculation researcher on a full-time

or part-time basis. In some cases, this was an instructor or a staff member with a full schedule of other responsibilities. The review teams identified only one college that had not clearly assigned matriculation research and evaluation responsibilities.

Use of Research and Evaluation: *Lack of commitment to utilization*

Although there appeared to be greater commitment to implementing the research and evaluation component, most of the review teams were still not convinced that the colleges demonstrated a clear notion of utilizing evaluation information to inform decision-making and to improve program development. Implementation of the component, in many cases, appeared driven by the requirements of state reporting agencies rather than by questions posed by local campus decision-makers.

The way in which information was reported tended to hinder research and evaluation utilization. Although there were several notable exceptions this year, most reports were highly numerical and not carefully focused on issues of interest to faculty and staff, nor reported in formats that easily applied to real-life decisions.

College Data Base: *Not adequate*

Matriculation staff continued to cite inadequate data bases or processing systems as a key hindrance to implementation. At ten colleges, review teams concluded that although the data bases were adequate to meet the research requirements, the information was not fully accessible. Software programs were being installed or debugged, and data entry from individual

matriculation components and service centers was incomplete or unreliable. At least thirteen colleges did not have systems in place to track student participation in all matriculation components, as required.

Chapter Three

Successful Matriculation Practices

The deadline for the full implementation of matriculation was June 30, 1991, and the colleges under review this year had obviously worked to meet this requirement. The review teams certainly found more colleges with most components of their matriculation plans implemented or under way in 1991-92 than they had found during the previous year. However, none of the colleges had yet fully implemented all components of their plans. Admission, orientation, and counseling and advisement were generally well implemented. Assessment was in place at all the colleges, but there were problems at several colleges where single measures and unvalidated instruments or procedures were used. A minority of the colleges had fully implemented, effective follow-up systems or research and evaluation components.

• ***Overall, the review teams noted a number of effective aspects of particular components which might serve as examples for other colleges.***

These observations are presented in this section with a precaution. Although a component is commended, that is not to say that it was excellent in every respect. Rather, the citations present aspects which appeared effective.

Coordination and Training

The trend noted in 1990-91 toward greater commitment to matriculation among instructional faculty and staff appeared to hold for the 1991-92 group of colleges as well. A number of colleges had implemented faculty mentoring programs and involved instructional faculty and staff more actively on matriculation advisory committees. There also appeared to be a continuing trend to consolidate the responsibility for matriculation coordination in positions with campus-wide visibility and authority. The colleges were moving toward meeting the requirements of establishing long-term policies

and procedures that speak to the rights, obligations, protections, and responsibilities of students and districts/colleges.

Lake Tahoe Community College
The Matriculation Coordinator effectively educated faculty and staff about matriculation purposes, policies, and procedures. Administration, faculty, and staff demonstrated excellent rapport and effective communication. Student Services has also produced a comprehensive training manual for matriculation. (Ann Frentzen, Vice President of Academic Affairs and Student Services, Lake Tahoe Community College, P.O. Box 14445, South Lake Tahoe, CA 96151, 916-541-4660)

Mission College
The Coordinator's regular reports to the Academic Affairs Council, the Academic Senate, the Curriculum Committee, and numerous departmental and staff groups strengthen the positive feelings that faculty, staff, and students all hold for matriculation. The level of awareness and understanding about matriculation seems high throughout the institution, and the level of commitment to matriculation as a force for helping students succeed seems equally strong. The Administrative Dean for Student and Community Affairs and other staff administrators educated faculty and staff, using faculty flex day sessions, articles in the Missions *Messenger*, bulletins, and printed notices. A survey was conducted to determine how much various groups knew about matriculation and to help plan future training activities. (Ruth Madalena, Matriculation Coordinator, Mission College, 3000 Mission Boulevard, Santa Clara, CA 95054-1897, 408-988-2200 ext. 3302)

Admission

This component was consistently strong across the group of colleges reviewed. The campuses were diversifying their admission processes not

only to accommodate student needs, but also to accommodate the information requirements of each matriculation component. In general, the colleges were paying increasing attention to the needs of their diverse student populations.

Foothill College

Early registration was strongly encouraged at Foothill College. Students who were not taking mathematics or English or who had completed prescribed prerequisites could take advantage of earliest registration opportunities by telephone. A week later, students could choose to register by mail, and during the third week, another option was available when students could register at the college in person. Special student populations such as DSPS and EOPS participated in priority registration. (Larry Miller, Matriculation Director, Foothill College, 12345 El Monte Road, Los Altos Hills, California 94022, 415-949-7639)

Modesto Junior College

The district-wide computerized application was user-friendly. It was electronically scanned and the data were entered into the mainframe. The application included the data necessary to determine student matriculation status, and it captured all necessary MIS data elements. After an application had been scanned, the student was sent a New Student Appointment Card, which included the registration date and time, and indicated the matriculation activities the student must complete prior to registration. All new students were strongly encouraged to send their high school and/or college transcripts to the Records Office. Continuing students were required to submit a scannable Student Information Update form which reported the student's current educational goal, major, and demographic information.

The Student Information Center hired peer translators who spoke Spanish, Laotian, Cambodian, and Vietnamese. They were stationed in the registration area during times when it was likely that ESL students would register. (Susie

Agostini, Matriculation Coordinator, Modesto Junior College, 435 College Avenue, Modesto, CA 95350, 209-575-6470)

Assessment

The colleges visited had well-defined and often long-established testing programs in which a majority of new students participated. Increasingly, the colleges were involving instructional faculty in the assessment process and initiating assessment measures beyond testing to provide placement advice. The use of multiple measures and valid, reliable instruments as well as the advisory nature of assessment were still debated but increasingly accepted.

City College of San Francisco

City College implemented a testing system which was easily accessed from a variety of sites, required no appointments, was available year-round, and was linked to orientation. The Matriculation Coordinator worked closely with the English Department to select tests from the Chancellor's Office list of probationary approved tests. The college also elected to validate the Sequential Test of Educational Progress (STEP) and three locally developed assessment instruments: an holistically scored writing test, an algebra placement test, and the English Language Skills Assessment (ELSA) which measures ESL skills. (Rosemary Brinson, Matriculation Coordinator, City College of San Francisco, 50 Phelan Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94112, 415-239-3850)

Yuba College

The Office of Research and Assessment developed and published an excellent assessment booklet which clearly and concisely explained the assessment process and helped students begin to interpret placement scores. (Gregory Brown, Vice President of Students, Yuba College, 2088 North Beale Road, Marysville, CA 95901, 916-741-6707)

Orientation

Orientation was generally a strong component among the group of colleges reviewed this year. Most were attempting to implement comprehensive orientations through a variety of modes, for example, large or small group presentations throughout the year, extended orientation classes, comprehensive student handbooks, and video presentations. Although counselors were most often responsible for orientation activities, the colleges were increasingly involving instructional faculty and staff and students.

Mt. San Jacinto College
Lasting approximately two hours, the orientation included a tour of the campus, a discussion of college terms, student rights and responsibilities, grievance procedures, college expectations, college programs and services, and an interpretation of assessment results and placement recommendations. All of the information was presented in a consistent manner because of an excellent orientation script, a comprehensive student handbook, an assessment information handout, and a form for students to use in planning their course schedules. (Leland Faulmann, Vice President of Student Services, Mt. San Jacinto College, 1499 North State Street, San Jacinto, CA 92383, 714-654-8011, ext. 1401)

College of the Redwoods
College of the Redwoods developed an excellent Student Planning and Resource Guide. In a clear, easily readable, and attractive format, it presented all of the information required by state regulations. The comprehensive guide contained a particularly good section regarding student rights and responsibilities, definitions of matriculation components, and exemption criteria for each component. (Juanita Chrysanthou, Director, Student Development, College of the Redwoods, 7351 Tomkins Hill Road, Eureka, CA 95501, 707-445-6752)

Cypress College

Cypress College made a significant effort to ensure that all students attended orientation sessions, which occurred several times each day about three weeks prior to registration. The individual orientation sessions were organized according to various student majors, and students attended the session most appropriate for their proposed majors. Orientation presentations emphasized course selection for first semester and completing registration forms. At the same time, students received results from their assessment tests and were advised about course planning. An excellent feature was that instructional faculty contributed their expertise and assisted counselors during the orientations. (Kristine Nelson, Matriculation Coordinator, Cypress College, 9200 Valley View Street, Cypress, CA 90630, 714-826-2220, ext. 161)

Feather River College

Students at Feather River College were encouraged to participate in orientation through several delivery modes. All students were invited to "A Day at the Lake," a large-group orientation for new students entering Fall semester. The presentations at a scenic off-campus location combined orientation and social activities. During the first week of classes in Spring semester, a similar event, "A Day in the Mountains," took place on campus. In addition, two three-unit orientation courses provided new students with a broad range of college survival skills and information. The college provided students with a wide range of written information in the college catalog, schedule of classes, student handbook, and brochures. (George McNulty, Counselor, Feather River College, P.O. Box 1110, Quincy, CA 95971, 916-283-0202, ext. 237)

Counseling and Advising

Counseling and advising were heavily utilized at each college visited. As in past years, counselors were directly involved in all matriculation components, especially orientation, assessment, and follow-up. For the most part, personnel in this component were very committed to providing services to students, ensuring that some educational planning occur and referring students to appropriate services when needed. The teams noted greater instructional faculty participation in advisement and more attention paid to the needs of bilingual students. While counselor assistance during course selection and educational planning were common at all colleges, counselors' roles varied significantly across the colleges and included: interpretation of test scores, providing orientation services, providing career assessment, teaching guidance classes, serving on matriculation committees, conducting follow-up, and tracking students. Counselors handled these roles quite effectively in the majority of colleges visited.

Shasta College
Shasta College established effective counseling services at off-campus centers throughout the district's vast service area. Lap-top computers, connected through modems to the college main frame, allowed counselors at the off-campus centers to access student history, assessment scores, and the Eureka program. (Dr. Margaret Dominici, Vice President, Student Personnel Services, Shasta College, 1065 North Old Oregon Trail, Redding, CA 96049, 916-225-4711)

Fresno City College
Counselors at Fresno City College designed a new Student Educational Plan form which focused on career counseling. They also purchased software programs which allow more extensive, in-depth counseling. In addition, the counselors offered half-unit educational planning classes to help students develop their educational programs. (Deborah J. Ikeda, Dean of Students and Counseling, Fresno City College, 1101 East

University Avenue, Fresno, CA 93741, 209-442-4600, ext. 8641)

Columbia College

Students at Columbia College could complete their Student Educational Plans in a number of ways. They were required to initiate an SEP by the time they had completed 15 units or their registration was blocked. Some students chose to fulfill this responsibility by making individual appointments with counselors, others chose to complete their plans through workshops attended by a maximum or 15 students, while other students enrolled in one of three different guidance courses to prepare their long-range educational plans. Counselors taught students to structure the SEPs and required them to input the semester course plans into the computer data system. (Judith Strattan, Vice President of Student Services, Columbia College, P.O. Box 1849, Columbia, CA 95310, 209-533-5106)

Las Positas College

At Las Positas College, faculty from electronics, fashion merchandising, interior design, and horticulture volunteered to conduct workshops for students in their respective majors. During the workshops, students worked with a counselor and a faculty member to develop an SEP. (Dr. Dee Roshong, Assistant Director, Student Services, Las Positas College, 3033 Collier Canyon Road, Livermore, CA 94550-9797, 510-373-5820)

Follow-Up

Many colleges appeared to have made progress in this component. At most campuses, follow-up procedures were in place for students in special programs such as EOPS and DSPS, and a few colleges had fully implemented early monitoring systems for the general student population. The best of

these were done early in the semester, involved extensive instructional faculty participation, and utilized the information for counseling and advisement.

Chabot College
The Office of Matriculation and Academic Standards received a list of students with a GPA below 2.0 and who had earned fewer than 18 units. Letters were sent to these students alerting them of the college's concern and inviting them to consult with a counselor or other support services. The early identification occurred well before students found themselves on academic probation or subject to dismissal. (Donna Marie Ferro, Associate Dean, Matriculation and Academic Standards, Chabot College, 25555 Hesperian Boulevard, Hayward, CA 94545, 510-786-6605)

Lake Tahoe Community College
A very student-centered instructional faculty, with generally small classes, closely monitored student progress, especially in basic skills classes. Instructors and counselors used the same form to refer students to support services, and the SEP included a space to record referrals. The Learning Assistance Center, which provided both tutoring and assessment, was an important part of the college's follow-up effort. An academic progress report form was developed for EOPS, Financial Aid, DSPS, Veterans, and Matriculation and was distributed early in the semester to identify students in academic difficulty. (Ann Frentzen, Vice President, Academic Affairs and Student Services, Lake Tahoe Community College, P.O. Box 14445, South Lake Tahoe, CA 96151, 916-541-4660)

Research and Evaluation

As in past years, development of matriculation research and evaluation appears to be slow in coming. However, in a number of instances, colleges

have begun to develop the appropriate research infrastructures with trained personnel and adequate data bases to meet the requirements of state regulations. Although none of the colleges had fully implemented this component, several colleges appeared to be well on the way.

Cypress College

A research specialist had been hired on a consulting basis to explore questions regarding assessment and placement practices and their relationship to measures of student achievement, such as persistence, grade point average, and retention. The preliminary studies also concerned students' demographic characteristics as they related to enrollment status. Two other studies were under way: a survey of student use of and satisfaction with Cypress College programs, and an analysis of the disproportionate impact of assessment on groups of students described in terms of ethnicity, gender, and age. The researcher appeared to enjoy credibility among the college faculty, administrators, and staff, and she had apparently involved all key campus audiences, as well as district Information Services staff, in establishing research and evaluation priorities, identifying credible, appropriate variables, and creating sound sample groups and data bases for analyses. (Kristine Nelson, Matriculation Coordinator, Cypress College, 9200 Valley View Street, Cypress, CA 90630, 714-826-2220, ext. 161)

Solano Community College

A potentially comprehensive, longitudinal database was being developed at Solano College through an interface of assessment data, student information data, and the electronic SEP. The college's research and evaluation plan struck a good balance among quantitative and qualitative designs and measures drawn from the Chancellor's Office recommended research designs as well as from campus-initiated studies. When fully implemented, the projects should yield valuable information about how matriculation contributes to student success at the

college. (Rob Simas, Interim Matriculation Coordinator, Solano Community College, 4000 Suisun Valley Road, Suisun City, CA 94585, 707-864-7102)

Mission College

Mission College has established a rigorous and comprehensive research and evaluation effort, located in the Office of Institutional Research. The broad range of planned activities and research designs as well as those currently underway show strong evidence of the institutional commitment to effectively addressing each matriculation component standard identified under research and evaluation. This office is responsible for conducting institutional as well as matriculation research, and both needs are being met. Collaborative efforts of West Valley-Mission Computer Services, Mission's Research Analyst, and the Matriculation Coordinator ensured collection of appropriate matriculation data. The Research Analyst involved all the appropriate administrative and academic units affected by matriculation research in the design and implementation of completed and planned studies. In addition, the Research Analyst has played an active role in local and state efforts to design valid and reliable research studies to support matriculation. (Ruth Madalena, Matriculation Coordinator, Mission College, 3000 Mission Boulevard, Santa Clara, CA 95054-1897, 408-988-2200 ext. 3302)

•Generally, admission, orientation, and counseling and advising were the most fully implemented of the components.

Appendix A

Matriculation Site Visit Evaluations Conducted in 1991-92

MATRICULATION EVALUATIONS: 1991-92

Barstow
Chabot
Coastline
Columbia
Cypress
Feather River
Foothill
Fresno City
Lake Tahoe
Las Positas
Los Angeles Harbor
Mission
Modesto
Mt. San Jacinto
Redwoods
San Francisco
Shasta
Solano
West Los Angeles
Yuba

Matriculation evaluations by region, 1991-92

Region 1

Feather River
Redwoods
Shasta

Region 2

Lake Tahoe
Solano
Yuba

Region 3

San Francisco

Region 4

Chabot
Foothill
Las Positas
Mission

Region 5

Columbia
Fresno City
Modesto

Region 7

Los Angeles Harbor
West Los Angeles

Region 8

Coastline
Cypress

Region 9

Barstow
Mt. San Jacinto

Appendix B

Matriculation Evaluation Review Procedures

TEAM MEMBER'S GUIDE

to the

MATRICULATION EVALUATION

Mission College

May 12-15, 1992

This guide is designed to explain the matriculation evaluation to the review team member. It should familiarize you, as a team member, with the review process and help ensure that the site visit runs smoothly and effectively. The guide is divided into four parts: an overview of the evaluation process, including the site visit; a description of the review team; a description of the evaluation of matriculation and your role in it; and a suggested timeline for the site visit.

I. Overview

The Chancellor's Office will use the fourth year of the six-year accreditation calendar (i.e., the academic year prior to the self-study year) as the time frame within which evaluations of matriculation will be conducted. This approach will provide the districts and programs a predictable, widely-used calendar on which to plan for the evaluations. It will also allow Chancellor's Office staff to better coordinate the site visits.

A list of the colleges whose matriculation process will be reviewed in 1991-92 is attached. These are the colleges whose comprehensive accreditation visit will take place in 1993-94. Colleges and districts will be notified individually of the dates their matriculation site visits.

The matriculation evaluation has four main purposes:

1. To provide formative evaluation information to the colleges and districts regarding the implementation of matriculation, and to assist the colleges in strengthening the process;

2. To provide the colleges and districts with detailed, useful and timely information on the process, for use in the colleges' accreditation self-study;

3. To provide the Chancellor's Office with detailed information on the implementation of matriculation at individual colleges and information that can be aggregated for required statewide reporting (e.g., annual reports to the Legislature; reports to the Board of Governors, CPEC and other agencies); and

4. To provide matriculation-related staff at individual colleges the opportunity to exchange ideas and experiences with Chancellor's Office staff and with their colleagues from other colleges on the review team.

The first step in the evaluation is the collection and provision of information for the review team. This information will allow you to prepare for the site visit well before you arrive on campus. Approximately one month before the site visit, the Chancellor's Office will send you a copy of the college's **matriculation plan**, its recent **Progress and Expenditure Reports**, and this **Guide**. At about the same time, the college's matriculation coordinator will send to each team member a **Matriculation Information Packet** (checklist attached). In some cases, of course, the college may not use or have available all the items, while in other cases one item is included within another (e.g., matriculation appeals procedures within the catalog or course schedule). If item 27 (the matriculation research and evaluation studies) entails a very large volume of materials, unsuitable for mailing, the coordinator will have the studies available for the team members' review when they arrive at the college.

The coordinator will also prepare a **Staffing Survey** of college and/or district positions that have been funded from the state matriculation allocation since the inception of state support in 1987-88 (example attached). The survey is designed to collect a selected set of fiscal and operational information about matriculation that will help the Chancellor's Office, the districts and the colleges further develop their accountability procedures. The information will also help the evaluation team focus on those areas where the college has expanded its staffing and services in line with its matriculation plan. The survey is to be completed several weeks before the site visit; the team chair will make it available to the team members on site, if not before.

Finally, the coordinator will include her own **Brief Self-Assessment** of matriculation at Mission in the team's Information Packet. The self-assessment describes the strengths of the matriculation process at Mission and

the areas in which it needs further development. By design, there are no specific instructions for completing this page; it is intended to give the team a candid, not necessarily objective, perspective on matriculation at Mission.

The second step in the evaluation is the site visit to the campus. Each of the colleges will be visited by a review team that is composed of selected matriculation-related staff from other colleges in the state and an independent evaluation consultant (Educational Evaluation Associates) contracted to assist the Chancellor's Office with the site visit. Each matriculation evaluation will be based on the college's approved plan, any up-dates or revisions to it, and the annual progress reports; the documents distributed before the site visit; a review of files and other documentation available on campus; interviews with administrators, instructors, certificated and classified staff, and students; and observations (where possible) of matriculation services and activities.

An oral report of the team's findings and recommendations on matriculation will be presented on the last day of the site visit. The report will contain component-specific and matriculation-wide observations. A written final report will then be produced within one month of the site visit. Follow-up on the report and its recommendations, including the college's corrective actions (if any are needed), will be a shared responsibility between the college and the Chancellor's Office.

II. The Evaluation Team

For the 1991-92 academic year, the Chancellor's Office has contracted with Educational Evaluation Associates (EEA) to assist in conducting the matriculation evaluation site visits. The consultant will chair the evaluation team and will work with the Chancellor's Office to coordinate all pre-site-visit activities (letters, instructions, selection of team members, interview schedules, and communication with the campus); all on-site activities

(introductior team meetings, preparation of the oral report, presentation of the report); and the preparation of the written reports. This individual will also share data-gathering responsibilities with the other team members during the site visit, including staff and student interviews.

Aside from the team chair, the team members will be matriculation coordinators or other matriculation-related staff at other colleges. The review team will function as a single team, with each member having both component-specific and program-wide responsibilities. In this way, the team's structure and duties will closely resemble the college's own structure, i.e., individuals who focus on one or more component while coordinating it with other matriculation services and college operations. This approach will also ensure that the final evaluation report contains both component-specific and college-wide perspectives and recommendations.

The size and exact composition of the review team will vary from one college to another, depending on the size of the college, the size of the matriculation effort (e.g., number of staff and number of students served), and the range and complexity of the matriculation services. You will be notified of the size of the team on which you will serve, and the individuals on it, as soon as it is finalized.

All team members will arrive the first morning of the site visit (Tuesday) and will have their initial team meeting at noon on campus. At 1 p.m. there will be an introduction of the team to the college administrators, matriculation coordinator and other matriculation-related staff; a planning meeting with the coordinator alone; and a general orientation to the college. The remainder of the site visit is devoted to interviews, observations, and review of documents. There will be formal or informal meetings of the team interspersed as necessary. The exit interview takes place Friday afternoon, and the

evaluation team returns home that afternoon or evening. A tentative schedule for the three-and-a-half-day site visit is attached.

A member of the Chancellor's Office Matriculation Unit staff will join the site visit team as an observer on the last two days of the site visit. He will sit in on the formulation of the team's findings and recommendations regarding matriculation, and will join the team at the exit interview on the final day. The staff member's role in the site visit is to "touch base" with the team members and with the program and college administrators, in case there are questions about the possible ramifications of the evaluation team's visit and findings.

While each of the team members may speak with slightly different groups of staff and students, and may concentrate on particular component areas, the success of the evaluation visit depends upon close coordination and interaction among <u>all</u> team members. The team will meet regularly during the course of the site visit, including informal discussions during the day and formal, structured meetings in the morning or evening. Team members have somewhat separate responsibilities and backgrounds, but their final product is a single evaluation and a single set of recommendations which embody their combined insight into the college's matriculation effort.

The Chancellor's Office will pay for your travel expenses to and from the review site, and will provide a per diem to cover your hotel and meal expenses. However, these are on a <u>reimbursement</u> basis and may take up to three weeks after the visit to process. Please coordinate your travel and hotel plans with Peter White in the Chancellor's Office, at (916) 323-5957, or with Charlene Canalita or Estelle Day, of Educational Evaluation Associates, at (310) 825-3460.

III. The Evaluation of Matriculation and Your Role in It

As a college staff member, your role in the evaluation is particularly important. Your special matriculation-related experience will bring a unique perspective to the team and to the college under review. You will share the responsibility with other team members for the matriculation activity review portion of the evaluation: for examining matriculation activities and staff assignments, comparing actual matriculation services with planned services, actual outcomes with planned outcomes, and developing recommendations for improving future matriculation activities. Most of your duties take place during the site visit itself, but some pre-visit preparation on your part is required as well.

Before the Site Visit. Your job before the site visit is to familiarize yourself with all the materials that will be sent to you by the Chancellor's Office staff and by the college. These will include the college's matriculation plan, any plan updates, annual progress reports, other available information about the college and its matriculation process, some general college materials (e.g., catalog, course schedule), and this guide.

The matriculation plan will be the central document of the site visit for you and the other team members. Most of your questions and interviews during the visit will be based on what is contained in the plan (and what is missing from it). Know it before you get to the college. Read it several times, and begin to formulate questions about the activities shown in the plan, the timelines, intended outcomes of each activity, and the staffing patterns of the process. Jot down these questions on your copy of the plan; they will help you greatly when it comes time to interview staff members and look through matriculation documentation.

Several weeks before the site visit, the team chair will assign each team member one or two matriculation components on which to focus. The chair and the college's matriculation coordinator will build your staff and student interview schedule around this assignment, and you will later be responsible for developing the team's written findings and recommendations in those areas. Wherever possible, the component assignments will be made in consultation with you and will reflect your background and interests.

There is no formal training program for evaluation team members. Most of what you will need to know is explained in this guide and will be amply reinforced "on-the-job" the first day of the site visit. If you have any further questions before the site visit, feel free to contact staff members of the Chancellor's Office Matriculation Unit.

<u>During the Site Visit: Your Activities.</u>

1. There will be a team meeting at 12 noon on the first day (Tuesday) of the site visit. This meeting will allow the team members to meet each other, to discuss the procedures to be followed during the visit, to review each other's component assignments and the respective interview schedules, and to share any initial impressions of the college's matriculation process based on the plan, progress reports, and so forth.

2. The Matriculation Coordinator will schedule an informal introduction (45 minutes) the first afternoon of the visit to provide you and the team with the opportunity to meet selected college staff and chat informally. This casual introduction will give the team an opportunity to establish initial contact with members of the college staff. It is important that all team members be recognized by college personnel, and this is an efficient and non-threatening way to accomplish this goal.

3. The next activity is a planning meeting with the Matriculation Coordinator. During this meeting, the team members will go through the college organization chart, the matriculation plan, and the most recent progress report with the Coordinator to determine interview and documentary sources for each matriculation activity or service.

Remember, your primary responsibility during the visit is to determine the extent to which each component is being implemented, so you will want to specify in this meeting which matriculation or other college staff members (including instructors) to interview to obtain this information. For some activities or services, the Matriculation Coordinator will be the

person who can provide you with the necessary information; for other activities, it may be other staff members, administrators, counselors, instructors, or even off-campus individuals.

There is a lot of information to be obtained during the site visit, and careful scheduling will ensure that nothing is omitted. While you and the other team members need not establish a complete agenda for the entire site visit this afternoon, it is best to schedule the important interviews in advance. This will ensure that all of the critical contacts are made.

4. The next activity is a general campus orientation. This includes seeing the matriculation office (if identified as such), a short tour of the campus, and an introduction to and brief meeting with the college President (if he/she did not attend the introductory meeting).

5. After the orientation, you and the other team members will get together to review interview tasks. (Note: the first informational interview with the Matriculation Coordinator should be conducted by all the team members together). Depending on the scope of the matriculation process and the range of college staff to be interviewed, you may work part of the time with other team members and part of the time on your own.

6. The team members begin to gather and record data for the program activity review.

- The first interview is with the Matriculation Coordinator. Using the matriculation plan as a guide, the Coordinator will be asked to provide information about all of the activities and services for which he/she was earlier identified as an appropriate informant. For example, the Coordinator will probably be the person who has the most information about the campus-wide coordination of services. Proceed through all the components, discussing those items that are immediately within the Coordinator's knowledge. Two or three separate interviews with the Coordinator over the visit's three days may be needed to complete the information that he/she has to offer.

- During the rest of the first day, all of the second day, and half of the third day that you are on campus (Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday), the team members continue to gather and record data by interviewing other staff members and students. You should be recording information about actual levels of service, the way these services are being delivered, and noting any discrepancies between actual services and the plan's description of proposed services.

- Your interviews and observations should also touch on students served by each component. As you talk with matriculation staff, ask about the number of students served by each component (estimates or, if available, specific figures from the recent progress report) and how these service data are recorded and collected.

7. A final interview with the Matriculation Coordinator will be scheduled for you and the other team members for the late morning of your third day on campus (Thursday). At this meeting you will complete any missing "pieces" of the review. If time permits, you can also use this interview to discuss other issues or concerns that have emerged in your interviews to that point.

While your are interviewing, keep an open mind. Remember that you will not be able to understand the entire matriculation process, much less draw firm conclusions and recommendations about it, until very near the end of the visit. Also, do not try to impose your own concepts, or some ideal matriculation process, on the college that is being reviewed. Let people explain <u>their</u> concepts and <u>their</u> activities, and try to understand them in their own terms.

You can share ideas from your college, of course, but try not to do this until well into the evaluation visit. We are there to hear about <u>their</u> matriculation process. What you honestly believe to be "sharing" can easily be interpreted by staff members under review as "orders" or "impositions", and can turn out to be misconstrued and even resented.

8. Not all of the information that is necessary to complete the program activity review will be obtained from interviews. You will also examine records, review component documents, student files, and observe activities and services where appropriate.

9. As the site visit continues, there will be formal and informal team meetings to share impressions and initial findings, and to make adjustments in plans. These meetings may occur during the evening, at lunch, or at other times during the day. The purpose of such meetings is to compare impressions, determine if there are significant discrepancies in team member observations, and suggest areas for more intensive review. Such meetings are important. Sharing insights and concerns early on will allow team members to redirect their attention into areas that warrant further scrutiny.

10. After the team members have completed their individual activities, you will meet during the afternoon and into the evening of the third day (Thursday) to prepare the team's summary findings and formal recommendations for the exit interview. The team chair will provide you copies of site visit reports from other colleges, to give you an idea of the length, tone, level of detail, scope and so forth of what you will be expected to write for the Mission report.

First, there will be a meeting of the entire team, to review each other's tentative findings in each component. Then the team will divide into component-specific groups to develop the more detailed sections of the report. (In fact, you may be a one-person "group" for one or more components.) Each team member will write a two-to-four page summary of findings for each of the matriculation components assigned to him/her earlier. These will be reviewed and agreed upon by the other team members, and the whole team will agree upon recommendations where necessary. The team's sections will then be compiled into a complete report by the team chair. (Bring casual clothes for this part of the visit; it may run into the late evening.)

Based on the findings, the team will make specific recommendations for the improvement of matriculation. When developing the recommendations, remember to:

- Draw only upon the facts gathered by the team about this matriculation effort, rather than trying to duplicate your own processes or to design an ideal process;

- Direct recommendations to the Matriculation Coordinator and his/her staff, rather than attempting to tell the college administration how to run its campus (much as we might be tempted to do so, that is not our job as an evaluation team); and

- Try to strike a balance between specificity (telling a Coordinator exactly what to do) and generality (providing possible solutions within an identified problem area).

These findings and recommendations will be presented orally by the team chair at the exit interview the next afternoon, and will later comprise the written evaluation report.

The matriculation report will summarize your general conclusions about the accomplishments of the process, its areas of weakness, and any special circumstances that are worthy of note. Listing positive characteristics is important since it serves to reinforce the strengths of matriculation and complements the specific recommendations for improvement.

Be ready for a very long day, this third day (Thursday) of the site visit. You will spend one half day interviewing on campus and then, after a short break, most of the afternoon and evening drawing up the team's findings

and recommendations. It can be exhausting, but it is also extremely satisfying. This is when all of your impressions, together with those of your fellow team members, will come together to form a common unified description of matriculation and of what should be done to improve it.

11. On Friday morning, the team members will meet with the matriculation coordinator alone for a pre-exit interview. This informal meeting, which usually takes place two hours before the exit interview, is an opportunity for the coordinator to hear and comment on the team's findings and recommendations before they are presented in the more formal setting of the exit interview. The pre-exit interview also serves as the time and place to discuss any off-the-record concerns the team might have: personnel matters, doubts, and issues or findings that must be said but not necessarily in the exit interview or the final written report. As befits an informal session, there are no minutes or recordings of the pre-exit interview.

12. After the pre-exit interview with the coordinator, the team members will meet privately with the President for a second pre-exit interview. As with the coordinator, this meeting is an opportunity for the President to hear and comment on the team's findings and recommendations before they are formally presented in the exit interview. Similarly, the pre-exit interview serves as the time and place to discuss any off-the-record concerns the team might have that must be said but not necessarily in the exit interview or the final written report. There are no minutes or recordings of the pre-exit interview.

13. The last formal activity during the site visit is the exit interview. At this time, the team chair will present the team's general findings and specific recommendations to the college President, other college administrators, the matriculation coordinator, and other program and college staff invited by the coordinator. The team chair may call on you during the exit interview to elaborate on the team's findings, based on your interviews and your own special expertise.

14. The written report will be completed and sent to the college and to you within two months of the site visit.

This completes your responsibility to the evaluation process. Thank you!

MATRICULATION EVALUATION

_____ College (date), 1992

Tuesday, (date)

12:00-1:00	Team members meet on campus
1:00-1:45	Team meets with college staff and administrators
1:45-2:15	Tour/orientation to campus
2:15-3:45	Team meeting/orientation with Matriculation Coordinator

	Team Chair (EEA)	Team Member 2	Team Member 3
3:45-4:30	_____	_____	_____
4:30-5:00	_____	_____	_____

	Team Member 4	Team Member 5	
3:45-4:30	_____	_____	_____
4:30-5:00	_____	_____	_____

MATRICULATION EVALUATION

_____ College (date), 1992

Wednesday, (date)

	Team Chair (EEA)	Team Member 2	Team Member 3
8:30-9:00	_____	_____	_____
9:00-9:30	_____	_____	_____
9:30-10:00	_____	_____	_____
10:00-10:30	_____	_____	_____
10:30-11:00	_____	_____	_____
11:00-11:30	_____	_____	_____
11:30-12:00	_____	_____	_____
12:00-1:00	TEAM LUNCH		
1:00-1:30	_____	_____	_____
1:30-2:00	_____	_____	_____
2:00-2:30	_____	_____	_____
2:30-3:00	_____	_____	_____
3:00-3:30	_____	_____	_____
3:30-4:00	_____	_____	_____
4:00-4:30	_____	_____	_____
4:30-5:00	_____	_____	_____

MATRICULATION EVALUATION

_____ College (date), 1992

Wednesday, (date)

	Team Member 4	Team Member 5	
8:30-9:00	_____	_____	_____
9:00-9:30	_____	_____	_____
9:30-10:00	_____	_____	_____
10:00-10:30	_____	_____	_____
10:30-11:00	_____	_____	_____
11.00-11:30	_____	_____	_____
11:30-12:00	_____	_____	_____
12:00-1:00	TEAM LUNCH		
1:00-1:30	_____	_____	_____
1:30-2:00	_____	_____	_____
2:00-2:30	_____	_____	_____
2:30-3:00	_____	_____	_____
3:00-3:30	_____	_____	_____
3:30-4:00	_____	_____	_____
4:00-4:30	_____	_____	_____
4:30-5:00	_____	_____	_____

MATRICULATION EVALUATION

_____ College (date), 1992

Thursday, (date)

	Team Chair (EEA)	Team Member 2	Team Member 3
8:30-9:00	_____	_____	_____
9:00-9:30	_____	_____	_____
9:30-10:00	_____	_____	_____
10:00-10:30	_____	_____	_____
10:30-11:00	_____	_____	_____
11:00-11:30	_____	_____	_____
11:30-12:00	_____	_____	_____

MATRICULATION EVALUATION

_____ College (date), 1992

Thursday, (date)

	Team Member 4	Team Member 5	
8:30-9:00	_____	_____	_____
9:00-9:30	_____	_____	_____
9:30-10:00	_____	_____	_____
10:00-10:30	_____	_____	_____
10:30-11:00	_____	_____	_____
11:00-11:30	_____	_____	_____
11:30-12:00	_____	_____	_____

MATRICULATION EVALUATION

_____ College (date), 1992

Friday, (date)

10:00 - 11:00	Pre-exit interview with Matriculation Coordinator
11:00 - 12:00	Pre-exit interview with President
12:00 - 1:00	Team lunch
1:00 - 2:00	Exit interview with President, Vice President of Instruction, Vice President of Student Services, Matriculation Coordinator and other college and district staff and faculty invited by the administration

Evaluation of Matriculation

Tentative Schedule for 3-1/2 Day Site Visit

Evaluation of Matriculation

Tentative Schedule
Three-and-a-half-Day Site Visit

Time	Activities
Day 1	
12 Noon – 1:00 p.m.	• Team meeting to review site visit schedule and responsibilities
1:00 – 1:30 p.m.	**Information Introduction** • Meet with program staff and administrators • Explain purpose of site visit
1:30 – 2:00 p.m.	**Campus Orientation** • Brief tour of campus and facilities
2:00 – 3:30 p.m.	**Planning Meeting** • Meet with program coordinator to determine interview sources and review program data
3:30 – 5:00 p.m.	**Gather and Record Data** • Interview program coordinator • Interview other staff, students
Early Evening	**Team Meeting** • Review progress of first day • Review, adjust assignments for second day

Tentative Schedule
Three-and-a-half Day Site Visit *(Continued)*

Time	Activities
Day 2	
8:30 – 12 Noon	**Gather and Record Data** • Interview staff members and students, observe program activities, and examine documents
12 Noon – 1:00 p.m.	**Team Lunch** • Monitor status of site visit
1:00 – 5:00 p.m.	**Gather and Record Data** • Continue interviews, observations, etc.
Evening	**Team Meeting** • Review progress of second day • Review, adjust assignments for third day • Draft initial outline of each component and questions to be answered prior to final report
Day 3	
8:30 – 11:30 a.m.	**Gather and Record Data** • Continue interviews with staff, students • Interview with President or designee • Review documents
11:30 – 12 Noon	**Meet with Coordinator** • Review team's final impressions
12 Noon – 1:00 p.m.	**Team Lunch**
1:00 – 2:30 p.m.	**Team Meeting** • Entire team meets to refine component outlines, discuss findings, draft recommendations across all program areas
2:30 – 4:00 p.m.	**Writing Time** • Team divides into component-specific groups to develop, finalize written findings

Tentative Schedule
Three-and-a-half Day Site Visit *(Continued)*

Time	Activities
Day 3 (Continued)	
4:00 – 4:30 p.m.	**Team Meeting to Discuss Progress**
4:30 – 6:00 p.m.	**Writing Time** • Team divides into component-specific groups to develop, finalize written findings
6:00 – 7:30 p.m.	**Dinner**
7:30 – 9:00 p.m.	**Team Meeting** • Entire team reassembles to refine final exit statement of findings and recommendations
Day 4	
8:00 – 9:45 a.m.	**Team Meeting** • Review and finalize the team's findings and recommendations
9:45 – 10:45 a.m.	**Pre-Exit Conference** • Meet with matriculation coordinator to informally review and discuss the team's findings and recommendations prior to the exit conference
10:45 – 11:30 a.m.	**Pre-Exit Conference** • Meet with President to informally review and discuss the team's findings and recommendations prior to the exit conference
11:30 a.m.– 12:30 p.m.	**Exit Conference** • Meet with President and administrators, matriculation coordinator, college staff and faculty